

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 92-cr-81058-10  
Hon. Matthew F. Leitman

D10, EDWIN CULP,

Defendant.

/

---

**ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO STAY DEFENDANT’S  
MOTION FOR COMPASSIONATE RELEASE (ECF No. 1060)**

Defendant Edwin Culp is a federal prisoner in the custody of the Federal Bureau of Prisons. In 1998, a jury found Culp guilty of (1) intentional killing in violation of 21 U.S.C. § 848(e)(1)(A) and (2) using or carrying a firearm in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 924(c). *See United States v. Culp*, 9 F. App’x 335, 337 (6th Cir. 2001). On October 15, 2024, Culp filed a Motion to Reduce Sentence and for Compassionate Release (ECF No. 1048). In his motion, Culp relied in part on updated guidelines promulgated by the United States Sentencing Commission, which provide that courts can consider an “unusually long sentence” along with non-retroactive changes in the law as “extraordinary and compelling reason[s]” in support of a motion for a reduction in sentence or a motion for compassionate release. (*Id.*, PageID.3548; U.S.S.G. § 1B1.13(b)(6) and (c).)

The Court ordered the Government to respond to Culp’s motion by December 16, 2024. (*See* Order, ECF No. 1049.) On December 15, 2024, the Government filed a motion to stay, citing two consolidated appeals that were then-pending before the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit. (*See* Mot., ECF No. 1055, PageID.3689, citing *United States v. McHenry*, Case No. 24-3289, and *United States v. Bricker*, Case No. 24-3286.) The Court granted the motion to stay. (*See* Order, ECF No. 1057, PageID.3694.) On April 22, 2025, the Sixth Circuit released its opinion. *See United States v. Bricker*, 135 F.4th 427 (6th Cir. 2025). The Court directed the Government to file a response by June 24, 2025. On June 16, 2025, the Government filed a motion to stay Culp’s motion on the basis that the Supreme Court granted certiorari in two cases to “resolve whether a change in law can provide an ‘extraordinary and compelling’ reason for a sentence reduction and whether the Sentencing Commission exceeded its delegated authority in promulgating Section 1B1.13(b)(6).” (*See* Mot., ECF No. 1060, citing *Rutherford v. United States*, No. 24-820, 2025 WL 1603603 (U.S. June 6, 2025) and *Carter v. United States*, No. 24-860, 2025 WL 1603599 (U.S. June 6, 2025)).

The Court believes a decision by the United States Supreme Court on these issues will provide substantial guidance in connection with the proper disposition of this case. Accordingly, the motion to stay is **GRANTED**. Proceedings on this motion are **STAYED** until the Supreme Court issues its decision in *Rutherford* and

*Carter*. The Government shall file its response to the motion **not more than twenty-one (21) days after** the Supreme Court issues its decision.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

s/Matthew F. Leitman

MATTHEW F. LEITMAN

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Dated: June 18, 2025

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served upon the parties and/or counsel of record on June 18, 2025, by electronic means and/or ordinary mail.

s/Holly A. Ryan

Case Manager

(313) 234-5126